



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,405	02/18/2004	Ook Kim	SII-2700 [SIMG0164]	3046

7590 12/08/2005
GIRARD & EQUITZ LLP
ATTN: ALFRED A. EQUITZ
400 MONTGOMERY STREET
SUITE 1110
SAN FRANCISCO,, CA 94104

EXAMINER

KING, JUSTIN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2111

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/781,405	Applicant(s) KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner Justin I. King	Art Unit 2111	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/18/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 30 recites “at least one radiation-emitting element”, “a first circuit” for driving the radiation-emitting element in response to a device of the first type is coupled to the cable, and “a second circuit” also for driving the radiation-emitting element in response to a device of the second type coupled to the cable. The Specification, as originally presented, does not disclose or enable one with ordinary skill in the computer art on how to implement *one single radiation-emitting element be controlled by two separate circuits and to response the statuses of two separate devices* on the cable. Applicant may have meant “first radiation-emitting element” and “second radiation-emitting element” instead of “at least one radiation-emitting element”.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2111

4. Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the *second* serial device" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 9-14 are rejected because they incorporate the limitations of the claim 8.

Claim 14 recites "a second serial device" and "the serial device" one lines 2, 3, and 5. In order to clarify and distinguish the "second serial device" from the "serial device", Examiner recommends changing "the serial device" to "a first serial device" in claim 14 and any other parent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 2111

7. Claims 1-15, 20-52, 55, and 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of the admitted prior art, Belopolsky et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,400), and Hochgraef et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,809,913).

Referring to claim 1: The admitted prior art discloses a cable with a conductor set (figure 1). The admitted prior art discloses that each cable has a different characteristic in effecting the data transmission (Specification, page 4, last 2 paragraphs, and page 5, 1st paragraph). Each cable's characteristic is the claimed cable data. The admitted prior art does not disclose the claimed memory and the claimed circuitry.

Belopolsky discloses a cable connector with electronic components coupled to at least one conductor of the conductor set (abstract, figure 1); Belopolsky's electronic components are the claimed circuitry. Belopolsky's electronic component includes resistors (figure 1, structures 36 and 37), which are analog memories. Belopolsky discloses that it is known to improve electromagnetic compatibility by reducing electromagnetic interference (column 1, lines 9-17), and Belopolsky teaches one to equip the modular plug with integral component for improving performance or adjusting the capabilities of electronic equipment. Belopolsky does not explicitly disclose that the memory storing any characteristic data.

Hochgraef discloses a cable with a memory module (figures 1-2). Hochgraef discloses that each attached device on the cable has different characteristic values (column 1, lines 22-24, 31-32, and 35-37), and such characteristic has its effect on the signal communication. Hochgraef teaches one to store transmission characteristic related information in a memory of the cable. Hochgraef teaches one to minimize the plug connection (column 1, lines 47-50) by storing

Art Unit: 2111

characteristic values (column 2, lines 48-50), which effect the signal communication, in a memory located within the cable.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time Applicant made the invention to adapt the teachings of Belopolsky and Hochgraef onto the admitted prior art because Belopolsky teaches one to improve performance or to adjust the capabilities of electronic equipment with a cable modular plug with integral circuitry and Hochgraef teaches one to minimize the plug connection (column 1, lines 47-50) by storing communication characteristic values (column 2, lines 48-50) in a memory located within the cable.

Referring to claim 2: Belopolsky discloses a serial device (figure 1, structures 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38), and the serial device includes the circuitry.

Referring to claim 3: Belopolsky discloses resistors (figure 1, structures 36 and 37), which are analog memories and elements of the serial device.

Referring to claim 4: The admitted prior art discloses the I2C interface (Specification, page 4, line 1) and Hochgraef discloses an EEPROM (column 2, line 1), which is a read-only memory.

Referring to claim 5: Belopolsky discloses that the memory is distinct from but coupled to the serial device (figure 1).

Referring to claim 6: The admitted prior art discloses the I2C interface (Specification, page 4, line 1) and Hochgraef discloses an EEPROM (column 2, line 1), which is a read-only memory.

Art Unit: 2111

Referring to claim 7: Belopolsky discloses that the cable includes two connectors, the conductor set is coupled between the connectors, and the serial device is included in one of the connectors (figure 1).

Referring claims 8-10: Belopolsky discloses light emitting diodes (LED, figure 1, structure 34), which is the claimed at least one radiation-emitting element. Belopolsky's means to drive the LED is equivalent to the claimed second serial device, and the LED is for responding to signals received on at least one conductor of the conductor set.

Referring to claim 11: The LED blinks in response to signals received.

Referring to claims 12-13: The LED emits light in response to the connection status of the cable; the connection status is a specific signal activity.

Referring to claim 14: Since the cable has at least two connectors, Belopolsky's first cable connector has a first LED, which is the claimed first radiation-emitting element; and Belopolsky's second cable connector has a second LED, which is the claimed second radiation-emitting element. Belopolsky's means to drive the first LED is equivalent to the claimed first serial device and the means to drive the second LED is equivalent to the claimed second serial device.

Referring to claim 15: The admitted prior art discloses that it is known to equip the serial link with cryptographic key set and to execute a verification operation including transmitting at least one cryptographic key of the key set over at least one conductor of the conductor set (Specification, page 2, last paragraph, page 3, first paragraph, figure 1). Both the admitted prior art and Belopolsky explicitly discloses a cable, but none discloses a secure cable. Hochgraef discloses a cable with a memory storing the data related to the signal transmission from the

Art Unit: 2111

attached device (column 1, lines 22-24, 31-32, 35-37, and 47-51). Hochgraef teaches that it is known to re-allocate the transmission related data from the attached device to the cable (column 1, lines 47-51). Hence, the cable is a secure cable when adapting Hochgraef's teaching to reallocate the cryptographic information from the attached device as disclosed in the admitted prior art to the cable's memory.

Referring to claim 20: Belopolsky's electronic component includes resistors (figure 1, structures 36 and 37), which are analog memories.

Referring to claim 21: The admitted prior art discloses that frequency-dependent attenuation is one of the factors effecting the signal transmitting (Specification, page 4, 4th paragraph).

Referring to claim 22: The admitted prior art discloses that the conductor set includes at least one conductor pair for differential signal transmission (figure 1) and EMI-related coefficients (Specification, page 4, 4th paragraph).

Referring to claim 23: The admitted prior art discloses that the conductor set includes a first conductor subset (figure 1, structure 22, Channels 0-2) configured for data transmission from a transmitter coupled to the cable to a receiver coupled to the cable, and a second conductor subset (figure 1, structure 22, Analog line) configured for serial communication between the transmitter and the receiver.

As stated above, the admitted prior art does not disclose any circuitry within the cable. Belopolsky discloses serial circuitries located on each one of the cable's conductors (figure 1); Belopolsky teaches one to improve performance or reduce EMI with these circuitries (column 2, lines 14-17). Since Belopolsky's circuitries are located at each one of the cable's conductors,

Art Unit: 2111

which are the serial communication medium between the transmitter and the receiver, and Belopolsky's circuitries are to improve performance or to reduce EMI, Belopolsky's circuitry is said to respond to the data request by asserting the accessed data serially to at least one conductor of the conductor subset

Referring to claim 24: The admitted prior art discloses Display Data Channel lines (Specification, page 2, lines 15-16).

Referring to claim 25: The admitted prior art discloses a cable with a conductor set (figure 1). The admitted prior art discloses that each cable has a different characteristic in effecting the data transmission (Specification, page 4, last 2 paragraphs, and page 5, 1st paragraph). Each cable's characteristic is equivalent to the claimed cable guide information. The admitted prior art does not disclose a subsystem coupled to at least one conductor of the conductor set, and configured to respond to a change in state of at least one conductor of the conductor set by asserting cable guide information.

Belopolsky discloses a cable connector with electronic components coupled to at least one conductor of the conductor set (abstract, figure 1). Belopolsky's electronic components are the claimed circuitry. Belopolsky discloses that it is known to improve electromagnetic compatibility by reducing electromagnetic interference (column 1, lines 9-17), and Belopolsky teaches one to equip the modular plug with integral circuitry for improving performance or adjusting the capabilities of electronic equipment. Belopolsky does not explicitly disclose that the subsystem asserts any information in response of a change in state of at least one conductor of the conductor set.

Hochgraef discloses a cable with a memory module (figures 1-2). Hochgraef discloses that each attached device on the cable has different characteristic values (column 1, lines 22-24, 31-32, and 35-37), and such characteristic has its effect on the signal communication. Hochgraef discloses that the memory of the cable stores these characteristics and the cable asserts the stored information to respond to a change in state of at least one conductor of the conductor set (column 1, line 15). Hochgraef teaches one to store transmission characteristic related information in a memory of the cable. Hochgraef teaches one to minimize the plug connection (column 1, lines 47-50) by storing characteristic values (column 2, lines 48-50), which effect the signal communication, in a memory located within the cable.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time Applicant made the invention to adapt the teachings of Belopolsky and Hochgraef onto the admitted prior art because Belopolsky teaches one to improve performance or to adjust the capabilities of electronic equipment with a modular plug with integral components and Hochgraef teaches one to minimize the plug connection (column 1, lines 47-50) by storing signal communication related characteristic values (column 2, lines 48-50) in a memory located within the cable.

Referring to claim 26: Belopolsky discloses light emitting diodes (LED, figure 1, structure 34), which is the claimed at least one radiation-emitting element. Belopolsky's means to drive the LED is equivalent to the claimed circuitry, and the LED is for responding to signals received from the attached device on at least one conductor of the conductor set. Since LED responses to signal received from the attached device, Belopolsky's means to drive the LED is configured to determine and to response the change in connectivity status of the at least one

Art Unit: 2111

conductor whether a device is coupled to the cable and to cause the LED to emit indicative of necessary information in response to determining that a device is coupled to the cable.

Referring to claim 27: Belopolsky discloses light emitting diodes (LED, figure 1, structure 34), which is the claimed at least one radiation-emitting element.

Referring to claim 28: The admitted prior art discloses different types of devices with different protocols, such as TMDS and DVI (Specification, page 2). Belopolsky discloses light emitting diodes (LED, figure 1, structure 34), which is the claimed at least one radiation-emitting element. Belopolsky's means to drive the LED is equivalent to the claimed circuitry, and the LED is for responding to signals received from the attached device on at least one conductor of the conductor set. Since the LED responses to signal received from the attached device, Belopolsky's means to drive the LED is configured to determine and to response the change in connectivity status of the at least one conductor whether a device is coupled to the cable. Furthermore, the LED emits radiation indicative of the cable guide information in response to determining that a device of a specific type is coupled to the cable when adapting Belopolsky's LED practice onto the TMDS and DVI as disclosed in the admitted prior art.

Referring to claim 29: Belopolsky discloses light emitting diodes (LED, figure 1, structure 34), which is the claimed at least one radiation-emitting element.

Referring to claim 30: The admitted prior art discloses different types of devices with different protocols, such as TMDS and DVI (Specification, page 2). Belopolsky discloses light emitting diodes (LED, figure 1, structure 34), which is the claimed at least one radiation-emitting element. Since each cable has at least two connectors, the first LED located at the first connector is the claimed first radiation-emitting element and the second LED located at the second

Art Unit: 2111

connector is the claimed second radiation-emitting element, and the means to drive the first LED is equivalent to the claimed first serial device and the means to drive the second LED is equivalent to the claimed second serial device. Since the LED responds to signal received from the attached device, Belopolsky's means to drive the LED is configured to determine and to response the change in connectivity status of the at least one conductor whether a device is coupled to the cable. Furthermore, the LED emits radiation indicative of the cable guide information in response to determining that a device of a specific type is coupled to the cable when adapting Belopolsky's LED practice onto the TMDS and DVI as disclosed in the admitted prior art.

Referring to claim 31: The admitted prior art discloses a cable with a conductor set (figure 1). The admitted prior art discloses that each cable has a different characteristic in effecting the data transmission (Specification, page 4, last 2 paragraphs, and page 5, 1st paragraph). Each cable's characteristic is the claimed cable data. The admitted prior art does not disclose the claimed memory and the claimed circuitry.

Belopolsky discloses a cable connector with electronic components coupled to at least one conductor of the conductor set (abstract, figure 1), and Belopolsky's electronic component includes resistors (figure 1, structures 36 and 37), which are analog memories. Belopolsky discloses that it is known to improve electromagnetic compatibility by reducing electromagnetic interference (column 1, lines 9-17), and Belopolsky teaches one to equipment the modular plug with integral component for improving performance or adjusting the capabilities of electronic equipment. Belopolsky does not explicitly disclose that the memory storing any characteristic data.

Hochgraef discloses a cable with a memory module (figures 1-2). Hochgraef discloses that each attached device on the cable has different characteristic values (column 1, lines 22-24, 31-32, and 35-37), and such characteristic has its effect on the signal communication. Hochgraef teaches one to store transmission characteristic related information in a memory of the cable. Hochgraef teaches one to minimize the plug connection (column 1, lines 47-50) by storing characteristic values (column 2, lines 48-50), which effect the signal communication, in a memory located within the cable.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time Applicant made the invention to adapt the teachings of Belopolsky and Hochgraef onto the admitted prior art because Belopolsky teaches one to improve performance or to adjust the capabilities of electronic equipment with a modular plug with integral components and Hochgraef teaches one to minimize the plug connection (column 1, lines 47-50) by storing characteristic values (column 2, lines 48-50), which effect the signal communication, in a memory located within the cable.

Referring to claim 32: The admitted prior art discloses performing the equalization (Specification, page 5, 1st paragraph).

Referring to claim 33: The admitted prior art discloses a transmitter (figure 1).

Referring to claim 34: The admitted prior art discloses determining pre-emphasis values for use in applying pre-emphasis to the content data (Specification, page 5, 1st paragraph). Furthermore, the admitted prior art discloses that each cable has a different characteristic in effecting the data transmission (Specification, page 4, last 2 paragraphs, and page 5, 1st paragraph). Each cable's characteristic is the claimed cable data. As stated above, the admitted

Art Unit: 2111

prior art does not disclose a cable with a memory for providing the cable data for use in applying pre-emphasis.

Hochgraef discloses a cable with a memory module (figures 1-2). Hochgraef discloses that each attached device on the cable has different characteristic values (column 1, lines 22-24, 31-32, and 35-37), and such characteristic has its effect on the signal communication. Hochgraef teaches one to store transmission characteristic related information in a memory of the cable. Hochgraef teaches one to minimize the plug connection (column 1, lines 47-50) by storing communication related characteristic values (column 2, lines 48-50) in a memory located within the cable.

Referring to claims 35 and 37: The disclosures of the admitted prior art, Belopolsky, and Hochgraef are stated above; furthermore, the admitted prior art discloses a receiver and a cable coupled between the receiver and the transmitter (figure 1). The admitted prior art further discloses that a receiver or a transmitter is configured to equalize data received over the cable from the transmitter in accordance with at least one equalization parameter (Specification, page 5, 1st paragraph). The admitted prior art discloses that each cable has a different characteristic in effecting the data transmission (Specification, page 4, last 2 paragraphs, and page 5, 1st paragraph). Each cable's characteristic is the claimed cable data. As stated above, the admitted prior art does not disclose a cable with a memory for providing the cable data for setting at least one said equalization parameter.

Hochgraef discloses that the memory of the cable stores the signal transmission related characteristics and the cable asserts the stored information to respond to a change in state of at least one conductor of the conductor set (column 1, line 15), which is equivalent to the claimed

Art Unit: 2111

configuring to use at least some of the cable data received from the cable to set at least one said equalization parameter.

Referring to claims 36 and 38: The arguments for claims 35 and 37 apply; furthermore, Hochgraef discloses that a release is set according to the data received regarding the circuit breaker (column 1, lines 26-28). Hochgraef's release is equivalent to the claimed receiver and Hochgraef's transmitter is equivalent to the claimed transmitter.

Referring to claim 39: The disclosures of the admitted prior art, Belopolsky, and Hochgraef are stated above; furthermore, the admitted prior art discloses that the conductor set includes a first conductor subset (figure 1, structure 22, Channels 0-2) configured for data transmission from a transmitter coupled to the cable to a receiver coupled to the cable, and a second conductor subset (figure 1, structure 22, Analog line) configured for serial communication between the transmitter and the receiver.

As stated above, the admitted prior art does not disclose any circuitry within the cable. Belopolsky discloses serial circuitries located on each one of the cable's conductors (figure 1); Belopolsky teaches one to improve performance or reduce EMI with these circuitries (column 2, lines 14-17). Since Belopolsky's circuitries are located at each one of the cable's conductors, which are the serial communication medium between the transmitter and the receiver, and Belopolsky's circuitries are to improve performance or to reduce EMI, Belopolsky's circuitry is said to respond to the data request by asserting the accessed data serially to at least one conductor of the conductor subset

Referring to claim 40: The admitted prior art also discloses a second device, wherein the cable is coupled between the device and the second device (figure 1). The admitted prior art

Art Unit: 2111

further discloses the conductor set includes Display Data Channel lines for serial communication between the device and the second device (Specification, page 2, lines 15-16).

Referring to claim 41: Belopolsky discloses a serial device (figure 1, structures 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38), and the serial device includes the circuitry.

Referring to claim 42: Belopolsky discloses resistors (figure 1, structures 36 and 37), which are analog memories and elements of the serial device.

Referring to claim 43: The admitted prior art discloses the I2C interface (Specification, page 4, line 1) and Hochgraef discloses an EEPROM (column 2, line 1), which is a read-only memory.

Referring to claim 44: Belopolsky discloses that the memory is distinct from but coupled to the serial device (figure 1).

Referring to claim 45: The admitted prior art discloses the I2C interface (Specification, page 4, line 1) and Hochgraef discloses an EEPROM (column 2, line 1), which is a read-only memory.

Referring to claim 46: Belopolsky discloses that the cable includes two connectors, the conductor set is coupled between the connectors, and the serial device is included in one of the connectors (figure 1).

Referring claims 47-48: Belopolsky discloses light emitting diodes (LED, figure 1, structure 34), which is the claimed at least one radiation-emitting element. Belopolsky's means to drive the LED is equivalent to the claimed serial device, and the LED is for responding to signals received on at least one conductor of the conductor set.

Art Unit: 2111

Referring to claim 49: The disclosures of the admitted prior art, Belopolsky, and Hochgraef are stated above; furthermore, the prior art discloses a receiver and a transmitter, and the cable is coupled between the receiver and the transmitter (figure 1). As stated above, the admitted prior art does not disclose any circuitry within the cable. Belopolsky discloses serial circuitries located on each one of the cable's conductors (figure 1); Belopolsky teaches one to improve performance or reduce EMI with these circuitries (column 2, lines 14-17). Since LED responses to the signal received from the conductors, and the conductors are the serial communication medium between the transmitter and the receiver, Belopolsky's means to drive the LED is configured to generate signals for driving the LED in response to commands received from at least one of the transmitter and the receiver on at least one conductor of the conductor set.

Referring to claim 50: The LED blinks in response to signals received.

Referring to claims 51-52: The LED emits light in response to the connection status of the cable; the connection status is a specific signal activity.

Referring to claim 55: The admitted prior art discloses that it is known to equip the serial link with cryptographic key set and to execute a verification operation including transmitting at least one cryptographic key of the key set over at least one conductor of the conductor set (Specification, page 2, last paragraph, page 3, first paragraph, figure 1). Both the admitted prior art and Belopolsky explicitly discloses a cable, but none discloses a secure cable. Hochgraef discloses a cable with a memory storing the data related to the signal transmission from the attached device (column 1, lines 22-24, 31-32, 35-37, and 47-51). Hochgraef teaches that it is known to re-allocate the transmission related data from the attached device to the cable (column

Art Unit: 2111

1, lines 47-51). Hence, the cable is a secure cable when adapting Hochgraef's teaching to reallocate the cryptographic information from the attached device as disclosed in the admitted prior art to the cable's memory.

Referring to claim 58: Hochgraef discloses an EEPROM (column 2, line 1), which is a read-only memory.

Referring to claim 59: Belopolsky's electronic component includes resistors (figure 1, structures 36 and 37), which are analog memories.

Referring to claim 60: The admitted prior art discloses that frequency-dependent attenuation is one of the factors effecting the signal transmitting (Specification, page 4, 4th paragraph).

Referring to claim 61: The admitted prior art discloses that the conductor set includes at least one conductor pair for differential signal transmission (figure 1) and EMI-related coefficients (Specification, page 4, 4th paragraph).

8. Claims 16-19 and 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of the admitted prior art, Belopolsky, Hochgraef, and Juan (U.S. Pub No. 2004/0230708).

Referring to claims 16 and 56: The disclosures of the admitted prior art, Belopolsky, and Hochgraef are stated above. Furthermore, the admitted prior art discloses that it is known to equip the serial link with cryptographic key set and to execute a verification operation including transmitting at least one cryptographic key of the key set over at least one conductor of the conductor set (Specification, page 2, last paragraph, page 3, first paragraph, figure 1). Although

Art Unit: 2111

the admitted prior art discloses that it is a known practice to construct a combined security structure wherein the memory storing the decryption key is coupled with a decryption engine, neither the admitted prior art nor Belopolsky explicitly discloses allocating the combined security structure on the connecting cable.

Hochgraef discloses a cable with a memory storing the data related to the signal transmission from the attached device (column 1, lines 22-24, 31-32, 35-37, and 47-51). Hochgraef teaches that it is known to re-allocate the component of the attached device to the cable (column 1, lines 47-51). Although Hochgraef teaches that it is known to re-allocate the component of the attached device to the cable, none of the prior art, Belopolsky, and Hochgraef explicitly discloses a cable with an executing means.

Juan discloses a connecting cable system with a processor (figure 3, paragraph 23). Juan teaches one to implement a plug-and-play data-transferring scheme between different devices with a cable equipped with a controller including a processor and a memory.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art to adapt the teachings of Belopolsky, Hochgraef, and Juan onto the admitted prior art because Belopolsky teaches one to improve performance or to adjust the capabilities of electronic equipment with a modular plug with integral components, Hochgraef teaches one to minimize the plug connection (column 1, lines 47-50) by storing characteristic values (column 2, lines 48-50) in a memory located within the cable, and Juan teaches one to support a plug-and-play data communication scheme by equipping the connecting cable with a processor.

Referring to claims 17 and 19: Hochgraef discloses an EEPROM (column 2, line 1), which is a read-only memory.

Art Unit: 2111

Referring to claim 18: Juan discloses a mask ROM (paragraph 23).

Referring to claim 57: The admitted prior art discloses a receiver (figure 1), wherein the cable is coupled between the receiver and the transmitter. The admitted prior art further discloses that the transmitter is configured to perform a verification operation with the receiver including by transmitting at least one cryptographic key over at least one conductor of the conductor set (Specification, page 2, last paragraph, page 3, first paragraph, figure 1).

9. Claims 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of the admitted prior art, Belopolsky, Hochgraef, and Onsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,811).

Referring to claim 53: The disclosures of the admitted prior art, Hochgraef, Belopolsky, and Hochgraef are stated above; none of them explicitly discloses that the transmitter or the receiver includes a LED and a circuit for driving the LED. Onsen discloses a method for display connecting status with the LED light (abstract, figure 6). Onsen teaches one to equip a LED on the receiver to indicate the connection status, and the receiver's means to drive the LED is the claimed circuit. Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art to adapt Onsen's teachings onto the admitted prior art, Belopolsky, and Hochgraef because Onsen enables one to visually determine the serial device's connecting status by equipping the serial device a LED.

Referring to claim 54: The LED emits light in response to the connection status of the cable. The admitted prior art discloses different types of devices with different protocols, such

Art Unit: 2111

as TMDS and DVI (Specification, page 2), and the LED is for responding to signals received from the attached device on at least one conductor of the conductor set.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 5,885,100 to Talend et al.: Talend discloses that it is well known in the computer art to equip a connector equipped with a LED, which that the LED responds to signals received on at least one conductor of the conductor set (column 1, lines 10-20).

U.S. Patent No. 6,311,270 to Challenger et al.: Challenger discloses a hardware a structure of security chip comprising of a memory storing encryption key and a decryption engine for producing decrypted content.


11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin I. King whose telephone number is 571-272-3628. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached on 571-272-3676 or on the central telephone number, (571) 272-2100. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications


Art Unit: 2111

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lastly, paper copies of cited U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications will cease to be mailed to applicants with Office actions as of June 2004. Paper copies of foreign patents and non-patent literature will continue to be included with office actions. These cited U.S. patents and patent application publications are available for download via the Office's PAIR. As an alternate source, all U.S. patents and patent application publications are available on the USPTO web site (www.uspto.gov), from the Office of Public Records and from commercial sources. Applicants are referred to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at <http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html> or 1-866-217-9197 for information on this policy. Requests to restart a period for response due to a missing U.S. patent or patent application publications will not be granted.



Justin King
October 31, 2005



REHANA PERVEEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
12/5/05